

### REMARKS

The applicants note that the Office Action indicates at pages 25-26, section 38, that claims 5-7 and 55-57 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 5, and claim 5 is cancelled. Independent claim 51 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 55, and claim 55 is cancelled. Claim 51 is further amended to correct a clerical error. It is believed that independent claims 1 and 51 dependent claims 2-4, 6 and 8-22 and 52-54, 56 and 58-72, dependent from claims 1 and 51 respectively, are allowable.

Claims 1-4, 8-54 and 58-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Number 7,593,433). As noted above, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 5 and independent claim 51 is amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 55. In addition, independent claims 23 and 37 are amended to include the subject matter of claims 5 and 55. Therefore, claims 1-4, 6, 7-54, 56 and 57-72 are now allowable, and reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

Wu, *et al.* discloses that FIFO buffers 1010a-n store data temporarily until in can be scheduled for output through a multiplexer 1006. The multiplexer 1006 pulls the data from the particular FIFO buffer 1010a-n according to a command from a scheduling table 1004, and sends the data to an input of a FIFO buffer 1008.

Wu, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest that a storage unit stores source identification information for a highest-priority source in the most significant bits of the storage unit, as claimed. Instead, in Wu, *et al.*, there is no teaching or suggestion that the scheduling table 1004 stores source identification information for a highest-priority source in the most significant bits of the storage unit, as claimed.

Wu, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest certain elements of the invention set forth in claims 1-4, 6, 7-54, 56 and 57-72, as discussed above. Therefore, it is believed that the

Application Number: 10/690,324  
Amendment Dated: January 25, 2010  
Reply to Office Action of: November 24, 2009


amended claims are allowable over the cited reference, and reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-4, 8-54 and 58-72 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu, *et al.* is respectfully requested.

With the amendments to claim 1, 23, 37 and 51 incorporating the allowable subject matter of claims 5 and 55, only allowable claims 1-4, 6, 7-54, 56 and 57-72 remain in the application. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, the application will be in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is requested that this Amendment be entered and that the case be allowed and passed to issue. If a telephone conference will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

In connection with this matter, please charge any otherwise unpaid fees which may be due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501798.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 25, 2010  
Mills & Onello, LLP  
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 994-4900  
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774  
J:\SAM\0442\OA\_020909\Response\_112409OA.doc

  
Anthony P. Onello, Jr.  
Registration Number 38,572  
Attorney for Applicants